Approved For Release 2005/08/03 : CIA=RDP81-00818R000100050071-1

DD/S 71-1388 OLC 74 0252

25X1

25X1

1 5 APR 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR:	Legislative Counsel
ATTENTION :	
SUBJECT :	Ervin Bill
137	
Bill in the Journal of the of the many items touch us the other day. It wo the Director is going to are going to have to agaimpact of the Ervin prowould like to ask that y information on legislation the material which we	ng with increased frequency references to the Ervin to Office of Legislative Counsel, and the Bill was one need on when the staff of the House Committee visited buld appear that sooner or later — and we hope later — to have to testify, and, in anticipation of that event, we aim prepare the Director's testimony. Since the internal oposals will be in the Security and Personnel fields, we ou provide the heads of those Offices with current live progress of the Bill in order that they may work will need to go into the paper for the Director. We meed for last minute efforts.
	Assistant Deputy Director

cc: Director of Personnel
Director of Security

000100050071-1ii down Lains and dustassition

for Support

Approved For Release 2005/08/03: CIA-RDP81-00818R009100050071-1

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

12 APR 1971

Mr. Wilfred H. Rommel
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D. C. 20503

Dear Mr. Rommel:

Per our phone conversation Friday, enclosed is a letter we have recently received from Chairman Hanley regarding an early hearing on legislation to protect the invasion of privacy of Federal employees. I am also enclosing copies of all material we had thought of sending Chairman Hanley in response to this letter providing you have no objection. This is essentially the same material on which you acted favorably last year. We have been in touch with John Martiny and Dick Barton, of the Committee staff, and they seem to appreciate our problem.

As you are probably aware, in the last session the Ervin bill was considered by Representative Henderson's Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service and we found him, and I believe a majority of his Subcommittee, quite sympathetic. However, consideration of this type of legislation in this session has been assigned to the Hanley Subcommittee on Employee Benefits and we are not sure just how he and most of the members of his Subcommittee view the matter. We hope to take some soundings in the near future.

In view of our concern over this problem, we would be grateful for any advice or assistance you can give us.

John M. Maury
Legislative Counsel

STAT

Enclosures